



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

R1 §§21 and 63). Exactly the reverse is, however, the case in the above-cited forms. Furthermore it is not clear why *eo* (*ea*) should not appear in the forms with *t* in the North on the same assumption. But they appear only in the late Kentish text of Matt.

Again consider how the combination Gc. *ju*- appears in the North and in Mercian; for example, North. (gospels) *ging*, *giung* (once), *gigoð*; V. Ps. *gung*, *guguð*; R1 *iunga*, *inguðe*, *iu*-, *gr-monnum*, etc. (cf. my Diss. § 38 e).

In connection with O. E. *gēt* the Frisian forms are usually cited in dictionaries as parallel forms.

Richthofen gives *ieta* (9 times); *ietta* (4 times); *iette* (4 times); *eta* (4 times); *ita* (twice); *'eet'* (once); Modern Fris. *jietle*. Can these forms be explained on Professor Hempl's theory? (cf. Siebs, Paul's 'Grund.', p. 733, § 22).

These suggestions are contributed to the discussion because the puzzling etymology of these words does not seem to me to be fully cleared up yet, though Professor Hempl's proposed derivation is in many respects a happy one.

EDWARD M. BROWN.

University of Cincinnati.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LONG. NOTES.

SIRS:—In reply to Prof. Brown, I would say that in my communication to the *Academy* I was careful to account for the *eo* in the Northumbrian forms by saying that the affection of the *eo* by *h*

"depended upon whether or not the initial *h* retained in any community sufficient of its consonantal value when it came into the medial position through the two words being regarded and accented as one."

Would it be at all strange if a community (or communities) where *h* was still effective, was one where the neuter form early got the upper hand? The literary use of *get* and *geona* side by side is no stranger than the simultaneous use of any pair of doublets of dialectic origin (for example, *sik* and *sek* in Chaucer, and *scuffle* and *shuffle* with us). It would be more difficult to explain the difference of vowel that my dialect presents in *god*, *dog*, *log* (with the *a* of *all*); *pod*, *hog*, *fog* (with the *a* of *father*).

As to the North.-Mercian representation of

Gc. *ju*, I do not believe it by any means certain that it might not be *geo*-. I have learned no satisfactory explanation of the doublets with *iu*, *geo*, but we all know that both forms were common in W.S. at least, although W.S. texts of some length show only one (Byrhtferð has many instances of *iu* but none of *geo*); so that the extremely few *iu*-forms found in North. and Merc. would not prove that *geo*-forms were not in use in the North. In fact Northumbrian has *geoc* Math. 11, 29 and 30 (cf. also Sievers §157).

As to the Frisian forms, the stressed vowel is explained by (Siebs, Paul's 'Gr.' i., pp. 723 ff.) §22, i, 2; §28, ii; §32, 4. *ieta* may be *iēt*+*ā* (cf. O.E. *gletā* above) §29, i. *ietta* may be *iēt*+*pa* (cf. O.E. *pāgiēt* above) §48, iv. This would require that *ietta* was (at least originally) used only in the past; but I have no means at hand to test the matter.

GEORGE HEMPL.

University of Michigan.

RUSKIN AND SHARON TURNER.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES:

SIRS:—Professor A. S. Cook, in MOD. LANG. NOTES for June, 1891 (vol. vi, 345-347), discusses a passage from Ruskin's 'The Pleasures of England.' In this passage Ruskin has taken "for example of the Religion of our ancestors" a prayer which he asserts to be King Alfred's. Professor Cook finds "a curious parallel to it" in the pages of Augustine, and shows that the prayer is merely a translation of passages from the 'Soliloquies.' He continues:

"Alfred then, merely translated this prayer from Augustine, yet Ruskin speaks of it as 'personally and passionately offered to the Deity' by Alfred, and thousands of people who read his book are likely to take him at his word. Yet it would scarcely seem that Ruskin obtained his translation at second-hand. It is not identical with a rendering of part of the prayer by Thomas Hughes in his 'Alfred the Great,' ch. 16, nor is it the same as the version in the 'Jubilee Edition' of Alfred's works. . . . But if Ruskin did make the translation himself, he has not always seized upon the meaning of the original. It so happens that two of his inexact renderings are at points to which he has called special attention by comments."

After showing the inexactness of the rendering at these two points, Professor Cook concludes:

"Is it not a pity to spoil such effective rhetoric, and mar so telling an illustration? Perhaps; but there is a 'pity of it' on the other side too, and it is one which will not have escaped the attentive reader of this note."

The charge of insincerity here brought against Ruskin is based mainly upon the assumption that he did not obtain his translation at second-hand. That this assumption is unwarranted is very easily shown. Wülker ('Grundriss,' p. 415, §481), speaking of translations of the Old English version of the 'Soliloquies' says: "Proben giebt auch Turner a. a. O. [History of the Anglo-Saxons] Bd. 2, S. 86 f." Reference to Turner discloses the fact that among the passages translated by him are those found in Ruskin. A careful comparison shows that Ruskin agrees with Turner word for word, with one trifling exception, namely, where Turner has "and through Thee all that live subsist," Ruskin has "and through Thee are living all those that are so." Ruskin then *did* obtain his translation at second-hand; the inexact renderings are not his, but Turner's. Further, Turner in this passage writes of Alfred's work in a manner that would naturally lead one who knew the prayer from this source only to speak of it as "personally and passionately offered to the Deity" by the King. Turner (Book v., Ch. v.) is speaking of Alfred's piety; after quoting passages from Asser on this subject, he says:

"But independently of Asser's account, we have two written records still remaining of the pious feelings of this admirable King, from his own heart and pen, in his Anglo-Saxon selections and translations from St. Austin's meditations, and in his additions to his version of Boetius."

After giving an extract from the version of Boetius, he continues:

"From the diffuse meditations of St. Austin, Alfred selected the parts which most pleased him, and has translated these into Saxon, with that freedom, and with those additions which makes his versions so often breathe his own feelings. As the King's heart is laid open before us in these chosen effusions, it may not be uninteresting to insert some extracts from them, as a further delineation of his real character."

The extracts are in three parts; introducing the second and third divisions, Turner uses the following expressions:

"After indulging in these lofty feelings awhile, he continues:—"

"One extract more, breathing the same warmth of feeling may be added:—"

Ruskin, evidently, was not a student of Old English; if he had been familiar with Migne, Paul and Braune's *Beiträge*, Cockayne's 'Shrine,' and Wülker's 'Grundriss,' probably he would not have spoken of Alfred's Prayer as he did; on the other hand, if Professor Cook had known the authority upon which Ruskin based his remarks, he surely would not have written just as he did of Ruskin and Alfred's Prayer.

F. G. HUBBARD.

University of California.

ARTIFICIAL VOWEL-ROUNDER.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES.

SIRS:—May I take the liberty to add one word to Mr. Raymond Weeks's remarks on "On artificial vowel-rounder" (MOD. LANG. NOTES, January, 1892)?

A few weeks ago I heard a young person, who was spelling to a little girl quite busy with writing a New Year's letter, whistle several times running when endeavouring to pronounce the French *u* distinctly. Then I was led to think that English people, in order to pronounce our *u* properly, should first whistle, then without changing the position of the tongue and that of the lips, try to give to *u* the French sound. Many a time have I made the experiment on English friends here and with success.

GUSTAVE FRITEAU.

Paris.

BUCHHEIMS 'BALLADEN UND ROMANZEN.'

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES:

SIRS: From the list of typographical errors among the notes to Buchheim's 'Balladen und Romanzen,' (MOD. LANG. NOTES, Jan., 1892), is omitted one of the most unfortunate, namely that on page 301, which places the "Interregnum" at 1554-1573,—three hundred years too late. The student who has been taught to expect freedom in Schiller's treatment of historic material in poetry, would nevertheless do him an injustice in ascribing to him so gross an anachronism as would be implied by this comment upon "die Kaiserlose, die schreckliche Zeit."

Other corrections to this edition are: